

DOUGLAS A. DUCEY
Governor



THOMAS BUSCHATZKE
Director

ARIZONA DEPARTMENT of WATER RESOURCES
1110 West Washington Street, Suite 310
Phoenix, Arizona 85007
602.771.8500
azwater.gov

Arizona Water Initiative Cochise Planning Area Stakeholder Meeting Summary

Date: October 18, 2016
Time: 4:00 PM to 5:30 PM
Location: Willcox Community Center – Main Hall
312 W Stewart St
Willcox, AZ 85643

1. Welcome and Introductions

- a. ADWR Cochise Planning Area Coordinator Natalie Mast opened the meeting by welcoming stakeholders, describing the structure of the meeting, and reviewing ongoing ADWR and Arizona Water Initiative activities.
 - i. [Next GWAC Meeting](#) is October 28, 2016.
 - ii. [Additional meetings](#) are being planned in other active Planning Areas.
 - iii. [Next Cochise Planning Area Meeting](#) is November 30, 2016.

2. Final Municipal Water Demand Projections

- a. Ms. Mast presented a summary of updated Municipal Water Demand Projections, originally presented at the August 10, 2016 meeting and refined based on stakeholder feedback during and after that meeting.
 - i. A stakeholder asked if the increases in municipal water demand over time were due to population. Ms. Mast clarified that the census projected population for the area was applied to a constant gallons per capita per day (GPCD), meaning that any increases were driven by population growth.
 - ii. A stakeholder asked a question regarding whether data from various water providers (not just city systems) in the area was included. Ms. Mast clarified that all Community Water Systems were included.
 - iii. A stakeholder asked a question regarding fluctuations in the calculated GPCD. Ms. Mast answered that since the numbers from Community Water System reports are self-reported, sometimes there are inconsistencies in the data year-to-year, but that the years used for the projection looked realistic based on local feedback and data from other similar areas.
 - iv. A stakeholder asked a question regarding the population growth estimates and source. Ms. Mast answered that the population growth estimates were based on federal census projections, which are broken down by the state of Arizona.

3. Discussion of Updated Background Information

- a. Ms. Mast presented a summary of updated background information, originally presented and discussed at the April 19, 2016 meeting. This updated information will be the framework for the background information to be included in the final report for the Cochise Planning Area.
 - i. A stakeholder asked if National Wildlife Refuges would be included. Ms. Mast confirmed that they would be included under "Ecological Resources".
 - ii. A stakeholder asked if there was a breakdown of private property ownership in the Planning Area. Ms. Mast confirmed that a breakdown of land ownership would be included in the final report, including percentages of the different categories of ownership.
 - iii. A stakeholder asked if source protection or water quality considerations would be included in the final report. Ms. Mast said that she did not currently have that information included, but she would look into adding it.
- b. Any additional feedback or additions are requested to be submitted to Ms. Mast by November 18, 2016.

4. Discussion of Updated Industrial Water Demand and Projections

- a. Ms. Mast presented a summary of the process by which industrial water demand data was updated and projected, how the data was broken down into subsectors and calculated, and how the new totals were different from previous publications.
 - i. Existing Data: Industrial Demand
 - A stakeholder asked if the Douglas Basin figures included the portion of the basin in Mexico. Ms. Mast clarified that the numbers only included the Arizona portion of the basin. The stakeholder asked what the direction of groundwater flow in that basin generally is. Ms. Mast said she would follow up on that.
 - Note: Very generally groundwater flow in the Douglas Basin is from north to south, and a map generalized flow direction is available at: <http://www.azwater.gov/AzDWR/StatewidePlanning/WaterAtlas/SEArizona/Hydrology/DouglasBasin.htm>
 - Multiple stakeholders had questions regarding numbers from the Strategic Vision that appeared to be incorrect. Ms. Mast clarified that those were the old projections and that hopefully the new calculations would address the issues.
 - ii. Mining
 - A stakeholder asked which mines were included, saying that there were two mines in the area that were expecting to be in production but the projections only included one. Ms. Mast responded that she would follow up on the additional mine to include that in the data. Another stakeholder clarified that it might be hard to estimate mining water use without feedback from the user, due to many variables in operations. Ms. Mast responded that it would be a best guess estimate, if there was no voluntary information provided from the user, and requested feedback with ideas or data for making that estimate.
 - iii. Power Production
 - A stakeholder asked about the source of the increase in the power production projections. Ms. Mast clarified that the increase was due to an additional power plant coming online. The Strategic Vision based power production demand increases on population growth, but in this process the demand will be held constant over time to reflect increasing efficiencies even as populations grow.
 - A stakeholder pointed out that the Cochise Planning Area combines different groundwater basins into one total, even though the basins are hydrologically distinct. Ms. Mast clarified that there would be a sum total for the whole area, but that the demands would also be broken down by basin or hydrologic unit.

- iv. [Dairies/Feedlots](#)
 - A stakeholder said that the estimate for the dairies and feedlots was probably high, and due to new efficiency equipment going in by the end of December would be decreased by an additional 30% or more for the dairy cows. The stakeholder said he provide additional details at a later date.
 - A stakeholder asked how the total was reached. Ms. Mast answered that it was based on the number of dairy and non-dairy cows in the area and a water use associated with each category of cow.
- v. [Turf](#)
 - A stakeholder asked about the volumes estimated for turf. Ms. Mast clarified that the turf numbers were calculated by finding a total number of acres of turf, and applying an estimated water use of 4.6 acre-feet per acre to each acre of turf. Ms. Mast also clarified that if there was some report or estimated water use from the schools or facilities, that these numbers could be modified and the estimates updated.
 - A stakeholder said that McNeal does have turf, but may do some rainwater harvesting to water that turf.
 - A stakeholder asked if schools were required to report use to ADWR. ADWR Deputy Assistant Director Gerry Walker responded that schools were not required to report water use.
- vi. [Other Industrial](#) (includes greenhouses, food processing facilities, and wineries)
 - A stakeholder asked if water use associated with wineries included growing the grapes. Ms. Mast clarified that the Industrial use for wineries did not include growing the grapes, but rather included processes like fermentation and bottling.
 - A stakeholder asked if medical marijuana greenhouses were included in the “Greenhouses” water use estimate. Ms. Mast confirmed that those uses would be included under the “Greenhouses” category.
 - A stakeholder asked if there was a plan for periodic updates for the data. Ms. Mast responded that there was not a set plan for those updates, but that the numbers would need to be periodically updated.
- vii. [Volume Projection](#)
 - A stakeholder asked about how data would be used and how final numbers would be. Ms. Mast responded that it was understood that the numbers were estimates and can never really be completely final, since there is no mandatory reporting in the area. ADWR Public Information Officer Michelle Moreno clarified that the information would be updated periodically, but the frequency of that update had not yet been determined.
- viii. [Next Steps](#)
 - Ms. Mast invited additional feedback and additional ideas for projection or upcoming increases in use, and requested that feedback be submitted to her by November 18 to be included in the November 30 meeting.
 - A stakeholder asked who determines the final numbers for the report. Ms. Mast clarified that she does the calculations and that data is internally reviewed before those numbers are presented. Ms. Walker clarified that the numbers were based on the best evidence or documentation available. She further clarified that the general goal is to spend about one year in each Planning Area, and that the final report would be discussed and modified through public meetings before being reviewed by the ADWR Director. Stakeholder clarified that he’s trying to understand how numbers might be verified and be ensured to be accurate. Ms. Mast confirmed that any numbers provided would be added directly to the report without modification. Ms. Walker clarified that the report itself might be general, but that there would be

appendices included with more specific information on the data provided and the methods used for each calculation

5. General Comment

- a. Ms. Mast opened the floor to any general comment or feedback from stakeholders.
 - i. A stakeholder asked if schools might be asked to keep records on water use in the future. Ms. Mast clarified that there were not currently reporting requirements for schools, so they could provide numbers voluntarily but, without some regulatory change, are not required to provide that information.
 - ii. A stakeholder asked if climate models would be included in agricultural projections. Ms. Mast answered that the method of projection for agriculture had not yet been determined, but that she was open to suggestions. The stakeholder suggested that local universities may have good resources for those considerations. A stakeholder asked whether Ms. Mast meant that they did not have a way to project total agricultural uses. Ms. Walker clarified that there are various projection methods available and that a decision had not yet been made which method or methods might make the most sense for the area.

6. Closing Remarks

- a. Ms. Mast thanked stakeholders for their time and feedback and reminded them that the date of the next meeting is November 30, 2016.